



**ROBINSON MCFADDEN**  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

ROBINSON, MCFADDEN & MOORE, P.C.

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

October 1, 2009

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

Mr. Charles Terreni  
Chief Clerk of the Commission  
Public Service Commission of South Carolina  
Synergy Business Park, Saluda Building  
101 Executive Center Drive  
Columbia, SC 29210

**Frank R. Ellerbe, III**  
1901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 1200  
POST OFFICE BOX 944  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29202

PH  
(803) 779-8900 | (803) 227-1112 *direct*  
FAX  
(803) 252-0724 | (803) 744-1556 *direct*

fellerbe@robinsonlaw.com

**Re: State Universal Service Support of Basic Local Service included in a  
Bundled Service Offering or Contract Offering  
Docket No. 2009-326-C**

Dear Charlie:

Enclosed for filing is the Reply Memorandum of the South Carolina Cable Television Association, CompSouth, NuVox Communications, and tw telecom to the Office of Regulatory Staff. By copy of this letter we are serving the same on Hearing Officer Butler and other parties of record.

Yours truly,

ROBINSON, MCFADDEN & MOORE, P.C.

Frank R. Ellerbe, III

FRE/lla  
Enclosure

cc: Commission Hearing Officer David Butler (via email & U.S. Mail)  
Other parties of record (via email & U.S. Mail)



COLRs in order to withdraw money from the USF. The forms require COLRs to provide their number of "eligible lines." CLECs want to see how COLRs have been reporting eligible lines. In its memorandum opposing the motion ORS argues that these documents are not relevant because "...all lines (bundled or unbundled) that include basic local service are counted for purposes of state USF support." ORS response, p. 2. This argument is completely unpersuasive and raises more questions than it answers.

The forms in question were adopted by the Commission as part of its USF Administrative Procedures by Order No. 2001-996, in Docket No. 97-239-C. In those Administrative Procedures the Commission required COLRs to submit certain information annually in order obtain money from the USF. See South Carolina Universal Service Fund Administrative Procedures (Exhibit B to Order No. 2001-996), Section VII, pp.8-9. The data required by Section VII of the Administrative Procedures is to be used to determine the amount of High Cost Support each COLR is entitled to. The calculation of High Cost Support is explained by the Administrative Procedures.

COLRs will receive High Cost Support based upon the number of eligible residential and single-line business lines served by such COLR in a Designated Support Service Area. The amount of High Cost Support is determined by multiplying the number of eligible lines by the per line support available for such lines in the designated support service area.

Administrative Procedures, p.3.

As explained in the motion to compel, the scope of discovery is broadly defined to "encompass any matter that bears on, or that could reasonably lead to other matters that bear on, any issue that is or may be in the case..." Oppenheimer Fund, Inc. v. Sanders, 437 U.S. 340, 351 (1978). While CLECs have not had access to the forms and are therefore unable to state all of the ways in which they will be relevant, it is clear that these documents bear on the issues in this proceeding and are very likely to lead to other matters of relevance. For example, the forms require COLRs to state the maximum amount that they can charge for their eligible lines. Since bundles and

contract offerings are unregulated it will be interesting to see how COLRs have responded to that question and the responses are highly likely to be relevant to the issues in this proceeding.

The Commission's Administrative Procedures make it clear that since the USF began operations COLRs have been required to report certain lines – those eligible for USF support – and exclude other lines – those ineligible for USF support. CLECs believe that unregulated bundles and contract offerings are lines that are ineligible for support and that such lines should not be reported. In order to prepare for the hearing on this matter CLECs need to see how the COLRs have been reporting their eligible lines. While ORS apparently has a different view of what is meant by the term “eligible lines,” CLECs do not agree with the ORS view and are entitled to obtain these documents in discovery so that they can prepare to advance their view of whether bundles and contract offerings are eligible lines.

The documents sought by the CLECs are well within the scope of discovery. They can be easily produced by ORS and can be protected by an appropriate order of the Commission. For these reasons CLECs request an order requiring ORS to immediately produce documents covered by Request 1-1.

Dated this 1st day of October, 2009.

ROBINSON, MCFADDEN & MOORE, P.C.



---

FRANK R. ELLERBE, III  
BONNIE D. SHEALY  
POST OFFICE BOX 944  
COLUMBIA, SC 29202  
TELEPHONE (803) 779-8900  
[FELLERBE@ROBINSONLAW.COM](mailto:FELLERBE@ROBINSONLAW.COM)  
[BSHEALY@ROBINSONLAW.COM](mailto:BSHEALY@ROBINSONLAW.COM)

COUNSEL FOR SOUTH CAROLINA CABLE  
TELEVISION ASSOCIATION, COMPSOUTH AND  
tw telecom of south carolina llc

AND

JOHN J. PRINGLE, JR.  
ELLIS LAWHORNE & SIMS, P.A.  
POST OFFICE BOX 2285  
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29202  
TELEPHONE (803) 343-1270  
JPRINGLE@ELLISLAWHORNE.COM

COUNSEL FOR NUVOX COMMUNICATIONS INC.



Susan S. Masterton, Esquire  
Embarq  
Mailstop: FLTLH00102  
1313 Blair Stone Road  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Steven W. Hamm, Esquire  
Richardson, Plowden, Carpenter & Robinson, PA  
1900 Barnwell Street  
P.O. Drawer 7788  
Columbia, SC 29202-7788

Benjamin P. Mustian, Esquire  
Willoughby & Hoefler, P.A.  
1022 Calhoun Street, Suite 320  
Post Office Box 8416  
Columbia, SC 29202

John M.S. Hoefler, Esquire  
Willoughby & Hoefler, P.A.  
1022 Calhoun Street, Suite 320  
Post Office Box 8416  
Columbia, SC 29202

William R. L. Atkinson, Esquire  
Sprint Nextel Corporation  
233 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 2200  
Atlanta, GA 30303

Dated at Columbia, South Carolina this 1<sup>ST</sup> day of October, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Leslie Allen